

# EXHIBIT A

1 DAVID CHIU, State Bar #189542  
2 City Attorney  
3 JAMES F. HANNAWALT, State Bar #139657  
4 Acting Chief Trial Deputy  
5 ALEXANDER J. HOLTZMAN, State Bar #311813  
6 JOSE A. ZELIDON-ZEPEDA, State Bar #227108  
7 Deputy City Attorneys  
8 Fox Plaza  
9 1390 Market Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
10 San Francisco, California 94102-5408  
11 Telephone: (415) 554-3999 [Holtzman]  
12 Telephone: (415) 355-3312 [Zelidon-Zepeda]  
13 Facsimile: (415) 554-3837  
14 Email: alexander.holtzman@sfcityatty.org  
15 Email: jose.zelidon-zepeda@sfcityatty.org

16 Attorneys for Defendants  
17 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
18 AND PAUL MIYAMOTO, IN HIS OFFICIAL  
19 CAPACITY AS SAN FRANCISCO SHERIFF

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

1 JOSHUA SIMON, DAVID BARBER, AND  
2 JOSUE BONILLA, INDIVIDUALLY AND  
3 ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS  
4 SIMILARLY SITUATED, DIANA BLOCK,  
5 AN INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY  
6 RESOURCE INITIATIVE, AN  
7 ORGANIZATION,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 vs.

10 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
11 FRANCISCO, PAUL MIYAMOTO, IN HIS  
12 OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS SAN  
13 FRANCISCO SHERIFF,

14 Defendants.

15 Case No. 4:22-cv-05541 JST

16 **DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN**  
17 **FRANCISCO'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS'**  
18 **INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE**

19 Trial Date: Not Set

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: PLAINTIFFS JOSHUA SIMON, DAVID BARBER, et al.  
 2 RESPONDING PARTY: DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
 3 SET NUMBER: ONE (1)

4

5 Pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant the CITY AND  
 6 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO (“City”) responds and objects as follows to Plaintiffs JOSHUA  
 7 SIMON, DAVID BARBER, and JOSUE BONILLA’s Interrogatories, Set One.

8 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

9 The City incorporates the following Preliminary Statement into each of its responses as if fully  
 10 set forth therein. As explained in Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss and Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion  
 11 for a Preliminary Injunction, the City is not an appropriate defendant in this lawsuit. ECF Nos. 24, 31.  
 12 The Pretrial Electronic Monitoring (“PTEM”) Program is a state function of the San Francisco  
 13 Sheriff’s Office and is authorized and governed by the Superior Court of the State of California,  
 14 County of San Francisco. By responding to Plaintiffs’ interrogatories or producing documents, the  
 15 City does not waive this distinction between the state and local functions of the San Francisco  
 16 Sheriff’s Office.

17 Before filing this lawsuit, Plaintiffs did not follow the appropriate process to challenge the  
 18 conditions of pretrial release. They did not raise their assertions with the state criminal court or bring a  
 19 habeas petition. By responding to Plaintiffs’ interrogatories or producing documents, the City does not  
 20 waive its arguments that Plaintiffs were not permitted to bring this action. Nor does the City waive its  
 21 arguments for lack of standing and mootness of Plaintiffs’ claims or its arguments that, even if their  
 22 claims might properly be brought as part of this action, Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim as to any  
 23 of their asserted constitutional violations.

24 The City’s responses to the following interrogatories are made to the best of its present  
 25 knowledge, information, and belief. The responses are at all times subject to such additional or  
 26 different information as discovery or further investigation may disclose and, while based on the City’s  
 27 present state of recollection, are subject to such refreshing of recollection, and such additional  
 28 knowledge of facts, as may result from discovery or further investigation. Therefore, the following

1 responses and objections are given without prejudice to the City's right to rely on subsequently  
 2 discovered or recalled information and evidence. The City specifically reserves the right to make use  
 3 of, or to introduce at any hearing and at trial, information and/or documents responsive to the  
 4 following interrogatories discovered or recalled subsequent to the date of these responses, including,  
 5 without limitation, any information or documents obtained in discovery or by further investigation of  
 6 this matter.

7 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

8 1. The City objects to each interrogatory to the extent that it may be construed as calling  
 9 for information that is subject to any claim of privilege, including, without limitation, the attorney-  
 10 client privilege, attorney work product doctrine, deliberative process privilege, and official  
 11 information privilege. In responding to these interrogatories, the City in no way waives any such  
 12 privilege or protection.

13 2. The City objects that several of the interrogatories call for information subject to  
 14 confidentiality and privacy protections, including statutory confidentiality requirements, or involving  
 15 sensitive criminal investigative information. Some interrogatories call for CLETS/CORI information.  
 16 Before the City provides this confidential and sensitive information to Plaintiffs, the Court must enter  
 17 a sufficient stipulated protective order including an authorization for the City to produce  
 18 CLETS/CORI information to Plaintiffs' counsel without redaction and placing the included  
 19 CLETS/CORI state law obligations on Plaintiffs and their counsel for such information produced to  
 20 them.

21 3. The City objects to providing information about all participants in the Pretrial  
 22 Electronic Monitoring ("PTEM") Program given that the Court has not granted Plaintiffs' Motion for  
 23 Class Certification and Defendants have opposed class certification. Producing class-wide information  
 24 at this point is not proportional or procedurally appropriate.

25 4. Plaintiffs' interrogatories do not specify the department or departments from which  
 26 they seek information. The City objects to providing information in the possession, custody, or control  
 27 of departments other than the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City has more than one hundred  
 28 departments, and it is not possible to provide information across all of them. Based on the nature of

1 this lawsuit, the City believes it is appropriate to confine its search for responsive documents and  
2 information to the San Francisco Sheriff's Office.

3       5. The City reserves all objections to the competency, relevancy, materiality, privilege,  
4 and/or admissibility as evidence of the following responses, and any document or thing identified in  
5 response to the following interrogatories at any subsequent proceeding in, or trial of, this and any other  
6 matter for any purpose whatsoever.

7       6. The City objects to each interrogatory to the extent it calls for information beyond the  
8 scope of discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Northern District of California Local  
9 Rules, or the Court's orders.

10      4. Subject to and without waiving the above general objections and privileges, the City  
11 responds to the specific interrogatories as follows:

#### **RESPONSES TO INTERROGATORIES**

##### **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

14       IDENTIFY each request for EM PROGRAM location data of PLAINTIFFS, whether through  
15 an Electronic Monitoring Location Request or otherwise.

##### **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

17       The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
18 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
19 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
20 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
21 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
22 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the phrase "request for EM PROGRAM location  
23 data" is vague. The City interprets the phrase to refer to requests by members of law enforcement  
24 agencies other than the San Francisco Sheriff's Office for Sentinel ankle monitor-generated GPS data  
25 for a PTEM Program participant.

26       Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The  
27 City is not aware of any request for PTEM location data of Plaintiffs.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

2 For each request for EM PROGRAM location data identified in response to Interrogatory No.  
3 1, state whether such request was granted or denied.

4 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

5 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
6 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
7 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
8 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
9 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
10 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the phrase "request for EM PROGRAM location  
11 data" is vague. The City interprets the phrase to refer to requests by members of law enforcement  
12 agencies other than the San Francisco Sheriff's Office for Sentinel ankle monitor-generated GPS data  
13 for a PTEM Program participant.

14 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The  
15 City is not aware of a request for PTEM location data of Plaintiffs.

16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

17 State the number of PERSONS enrolled in the EM PROGRAM as of September 28, 2022.

18 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3**

19 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
20 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
21 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
22 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
23 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
24 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that this interrogatory relates to Plaintiffs' putative class  
25 rather than their individual claims, and no class has been certified.

26 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: 346  
27 people were enrolled in the PTEM Program as of September 28, 2022.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

2 State the number of requests for EM PROGRAM location data YOU have received from  
3 August 1, 2019 through the present.

4 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

5 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
6 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
7 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
8 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
9 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
10 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the phrase "requests for EM PROGRAM location  
11 data" is vague. The City interprets the phrase to refer to requests by members of law enforcement  
12 agencies other than the San Francisco Sheriff's Office for Sentinel ankle monitor-generated GPS data  
13 for a PTEM Program participant. The City additionally objects to the extent "YOU" is intended to  
14 have a different meaning than the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City will respond with respect to  
15 the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City further objects that this interrogatory relates solely to the  
16 putative class and sharing of PTEM data with other law enforcement, on which motions are pending.

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The  
18 City does not track the number of requests for PTEM location data that it receives. That number can  
19 best be determined from review of Electronic Monitoring Location Requests. The City is willing to  
20 produce Electronic Monitoring Location Requests to Plaintiffs if Plaintiffs' Motion for Class  
21 Certification is granted, if Plaintiffs' assertion that sharing of location data for PTEM Program  
22 participants with other law enforcement agencies is unconstitutional remains in the case, and once an  
23 appropriate protective order is in place. The burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer to this  
24 interrogatory will be substantially the same for either party. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d).*

25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

26 IDENTIFY each request for EM PROGRAM location data, whether through an Electronic  
27 Monitoring Location Request or otherwise, from August 1, 2019 through the present.

1                   **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

2                   The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 3 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 4 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 5 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 6 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 7 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the phrase "request for EM PROGRAM location  
 8 data" is vague. The City interprets the phrase to refer to requests by members of law enforcement  
 9 agencies other than the San Francisco Sheriff's Office for Sentinel ankle monitor-generated GPS data  
 10 for a PTEM Program participant. The City additionally objects to the extent the interrogatory is  
 11 intended to seek requests directed to any department other the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City  
 12 will respond with respect to the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City further objects that this  
 13 interrogatory relates solely to the putative class and sharing of PTEM data with other law enforcement,  
 14 on which motions are pending.

15                  Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The  
 16 City is willing to produce Electronic Monitoring Location Requests to Plaintiffs if Plaintiffs' Motion  
 17 for Class Certification is granted, if Plaintiffs' assertion that sharing of location data for PTEM  
 18 Program participants with other law enforcement agencies is unconstitutional remains in the case, and  
 19 once an appropriate protective order is in place. The burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer to  
 20 this interrogatory will be substantially the same for either party. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d).

21                   **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

22                  For each request for EM PROGRAM location data identified in response to Interrogatory No.  
 23 5, state whether such request was granted or denied.

24                   **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

25                  The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 26 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 27 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 28 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the

1 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 2 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the phrase “request for EM PROGRAM location  
 3 data” is vague. The City interprets the phrase to refer to requests by members of law enforcement  
 4 agencies other than the San Francisco Sheriff’s Office for Sentinel ankle monitor-generated GPS data  
 5 for a PTEM Program participant. The City additionally objects to the extent the interrogatory is  
 6 intended to seek requests directed to any department other the San Francisco Sheriff’s Office. The City  
 7 will respond with respect to the San Francisco Sheriff’s Office. The City further objects that this  
 8 interrogatory relates solely to the putative class and sharing of PTEM data with other law enforcement,  
 9 on which motions are pending.

10 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The San  
 11 Francisco Sheriff’s Office does not separately track whether requests for PTEM location data are  
 12 granted or denied. Under its policies, the San Francisco Sheriff’s Office approves requests for PTEM  
 13 location data submitted via an appropriate Electronic Monitoring Location Request form that comply  
 14 with Sheriff’s Office policy. Approvals or provision of information may be noted on the bottom part of  
 15 the form. If a location request is submitted in an emergency situation, the San Francisco Sheriff’s  
 16 Office requires the requestor to submit a properly completed Electronic Monitoring Location Request  
 17 Form once the emergency has ended. The City is willing to produce Electronic Monitoring Location  
 18 Requests to Plaintiffs if Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification is granted, if Plaintiffs’ assertion that  
 19 sharing of location data for PTEM participants with other law enforcement agencies is unconstitutional  
 20 remains in the case, and once an appropriate protective order is in place. The burden of deriving or  
 21 ascertaining the answer to this interrogatory will be substantially the same for either party. *See* Fed. R.  
 22 Civ. P. 33(d).

23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

24 IDENTIFY each authorization, if any, that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has made to  
 25 the SFSO pursuant to California Penal Code section 1203.018 regarding the EM PROGRAM.

26 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:**

27 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 28 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an

1 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 2 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 3 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 4 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the Plaintiffs' definitions of "IDENTIFY" do not  
 5 make sense for this interrogatory. The City will respond with respect to the ordinary meaning of  
 6 "identify." The City additionally objects to the extent the interrogatory implies that authorization from  
 7 the San Francisco Board of Supervisors is required for or is an aspect of the PTEM Program. The City  
 8 will respond with respect to whether the San Francisco Board of Supervisors has passed an ordinance  
 9 for creation of a pretrial electronic monitoring program under California Penal Code section 1203.018.

10 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The San  
 11 Francisco Board of Supervisors has not passed an ordinance for creation of a pretrial electronic  
 12 monitoring program under California Penal Code section 1203.018. The San Francisco Sheriff's  
 13 Office operates the PTEM Program based on the orders of the Superior Court of the State of  
 14 California, County of San Francisco.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

16 State all facts in support of YOUR contention that "[m]any criminal defendants commit new  
 17 crimes while wearing a GPS device" as stated in the JUDSON DECLARATION.

18 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8:**

19 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 20 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 21 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 22 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 23 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 24 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that it is not possible to identify all of the very large  
 25 number of times criminal defendants have committed new crimes while wearing a GPS device,  
 26 demonstrating the referenced contention. Defendants have provided examples in declarations already  
 27 in this case. The City believes that many witnesses involved in the criminal justice system, from the  
 28 San Francisco Sheriff's Office and otherwise, have facts supporting the referenced contention. The

1 City additionally objects to this contention interrogatory as premature to the extent it calls for a list of  
 2 demonstrations of the referenced contention beyond the examples already provided in Lieutenant  
 3 Judson's declarations. The City relatedly objects that new developments supporting this contention  
 4 occur frequently. The City is willing to meet and confer with Plaintiffs about updating its response at  
 5 an appropriate time but objects to doing so continuously during this case as unduly burdensome. The  
 6 City additionally objects to providing privileged information in response to this interrogatory,  
 7 including information subject to attorney-client, work product, deliberative process, or official  
 8 information privilege protections. The City also objects to providing expert opinion evidence relevant  
 9 to this interrogatory before the period for disclosure of expert opinions. The City further objects to  
 10 providing law enforcement sensitive and confidential information in support of this interrogatory.  
 11 Confidential information can be provided once an appropriate protective order is in place including  
 12 provisions allowing provision of CORI/CLETS information to Plaintiffs and/or their counsel.

13 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: There  
 14 are numerous examples of PTEM participants committing new crimes while wearing a GPS device.  
 15 Compiling a complete list of all such examples would not be feasible given the large number and  
 16 continuing addition of new such cases. S.F. Police Report No. 220378172 reflects that Mr. Bonilla is  
 17 among those who have at least allegedly committed crimes while wearing a GPS device. Lieutenant  
 18 Judson identified as examples many such situations including those involving Lorenzo Grant, Joseph  
 19 Atchan, Erlin Romero, Damanuel Hightower, Greg Morten, Vermond Jones, Oscar Centeno, Oscar  
 20 Cerrato, and Michele Garabato.

21 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

22 State all facts in support of YOUR contention that a court ordered consent to four-way searches  
 23 as a condition of any putative class member's participation in the EM PROGRAM.

24 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9:**

25 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 26 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 27 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 28 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the

1 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
2 to bring this lawsuit. Plaintiffs here seek information about a PTEM program rule having decided not  
3 to challenge this program rule in front of the judges in their criminal cases. This failure to raise the  
4 program rule with the criminal court suggests Plaintiffs and their counsel understood the program rule  
5 to be part of the conditions of release from pretrial detention. The City further objects to this  
6 contention interrogatory as premature given the current phase of the case. The City responds with  
7 respect to its current understanding without prejudice to its right to update the response at an  
8 appropriate time. The City additionally objects to providing privileged information in response to this  
9 interrogatory, including information subject to attorney-client, work product, deliberative process, or  
10 official information privilege protections. The City also objects to providing expert opinion evidence  
11 relevant to this interrogatory before the period for disclosure of expert opinions. The City additionally  
12 objects that this interrogatory seeks information from the Superior Court of the State of California not  
13 within the possession of the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City responds with respect to the  
14 understanding of the San Francisco Sheriff's Office in implementing the orders of the Superior Court  
15 here. The City further objects that the current order releasing criminal defendants from custody subject  
16 to participation in the PTEM Program makes express the requirement of consent to four-way searches.  
17 Even if there were some uncertainty about whether the scope of the Fourth Amendment waiver  
18 required for participation in the PTEM Program included a four-way search condition before, the  
19 revised order dispels any such uncertainty.

20 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: At all  
21 relevant times, the Superior Court's order releasing pretrial criminal defendants from custody subject  
22 to their participation in the PTEM Program has acknowledged the defendants' waiver of their Fourth  
23 Amendment rights for the four-way search condition. Consistent with that, PTEM Program  
24 participants, including Plaintiffs, sign the OR Release order in court and the PTEM Program Rules and  
25 Contract at the Community Programs Office. PTEM Program participants now also sign an order  
26 releasing them from custody subject to participation in the PTEM Program that includes the Fourth  
27 Amendment waiver and an express reference to the four-way search condition. Outside of court, the  
28 San Francisco Public Defender's Office has been a participant in discussions with the Superior Court,

1 District Attorney's Office, and Sheriff's Office regarding the PTEM Program including the four-way  
 2 search condition. Court participants including criminal defendants' counsel and defendants receive a  
 3 copy of the PTEM Order. Criminal defendants and their counsel must raise any concerns with  
 4 conditions of pretrial release with the state criminal court. No Plaintiff and few other criminal  
 5 defendants appear to have done so. To the City's knowledge, judges have rejected attempts to  
 6 eliminate the four-way search condition when it is contested. The San Francisco Sheriff's Office is not  
 7 in a position to question the validity of the Fourth Amendment waiver entered by the criminal court.  
 8 Plaintiffs needed to direct the concerns they raise here about the validity of the Fourth Amendment  
 9 waiver to the criminal court in the first instance.

10 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

11 IDENTIFY all PERSONS who assisted in drafting Rule 5 of the PROGRAM RULES.

12 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10:**

13 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 14 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 15 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 16 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 17 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 18 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects to the definition of "IDENTIFY" to the extent it would  
 19 require the City to provide contact information for its employees and former employees, who should  
 20 be contacted through counsel for the City. The City additionally objects that it is unduly burdensome,  
 21 likely impossible, and would serve no purpose to identify all individuals going back to the 1980s who  
 22 were involved in drafting the referenced program rule. The City further objects that it is unduly  
 23 burdensome to identify by name all individuals outside of the San Francisco Sheriff's Office with  
 24 input on the referenced program rule. The City identifies the names of individuals at the San Francisco  
 25 Sheriff's Office in more recent years involved with the drafting of the four-way search condition in the  
 26 program rules. The City additionally objects that "assisted with drafting" is vague and responds with  
 27 respect to individuals involved with the drafting of the program rule reflecting a four-way search  
 28 condition.

1       Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: A four-  
 2 way search condition has been a component of the court-authorized pretrial monitoring program since  
 3 at least the 1980s, and it is therefore not feasible to identify all people who were involved in drafting  
 4 what is now Rule 5 of the Program Rules. In more recent years, outside of the San Francisco Sheriff's  
 5 Office, people with input on Rule 5 of the Program Rules have included judges and staff of the  
 6 Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco; members of the San Francisco  
 7 Public Defender's Office; and members of the San Francisco District Attorney's Office. Within the  
 8 San Francisco Sheriff's Office, individuals involved in drafting Rule 5 of the Program Rules have  
 9 included Undersheriff Katherine Johnson; Chief Deputies Michele Fisher, Kevin Fisher-Paulson, and  
 10 Lisette Adams; Parole Director Kevin Foster; Captains Alejandro Cabebe and Stephanie Colmenero;  
 11 Lieutenants Sara O'Malley, Dwight Gunn, Jonathan Kuhns, and Phillip Judson; Sheriff's Deputies  
 12 including Deputies Ngawang Bista and David Campillo; and Chief Counsel Margaret Baumgartner.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

14       IDENTIFY all PERSONS who assisted in drafting Rule 13 of the PROGRAM RULES.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11:**

16       The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 17 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 18 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 19 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 20 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 21 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects to the definition of "IDENTIFY" to the extent it would  
 22 require the City to provide contact information for its employees and former employees, who should  
 23 be contacted through counsel for the City. The City additionally objects that it is unduly burdensome  
 24 to identify by name all individuals outside of the San Francisco Sheriff's Office with input on the  
 25 referenced program rule. The City identifies the names of individuals at the San Francisco Sheriff's  
 26 Office in more recent years involved with the drafting of the program rule letting PTEM Program  
 27 participants know that their GPS data may be shared with other law enforcement agencies. The City  
 28 additionally objects that "assisted with drafting" is vague and responds with respect to individuals

1 involved with the drafting of the program rule reflecting that participants' GPS data may be shared  
 2 with other law enforcement agencies. The City further objects to the interrogatory to the extent it  
 3 misrepresents the role of the program rule in providing transparency to PTEM Program participants  
 4 about the potential sharing of GPS data with other law enforcement agencies.

5 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: Outside  
 6 of the San Francisco Sheriff's Office, people with input on Rule 13 of the Program Rules have  
 7 included judges and staff of the Superior Court of the State of California, County of San Francisco;  
 8 members of the San Francisco Public Defender's Office; and members of the San Francisco District  
 9 Attorney's Office. Within the San Francisco Sheriff's Office, individuals involved in drafting Rule 13  
 10 of the Program Rules have included Undersheriff Katherine Johnson; Chief Deputies Michele Fisher,  
 11 Kevin Fisher-Paulson, and Lisette Adams; Parole Director Kevin Foster; Captains Alejandro Cabebe,  
 12 and Stephanie Colmenero; Lieutenants Sara O'Malley, Dwight Gunn, Jonathan Kuhns, and Phillip  
 13 Judson; Sheriff's Deputies including Deputies Ngawang Bista and David Campillo; and Chief Counsel  
 14 Margaret Baumgartner.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

16 State all facts supporting YOUR contention that Rule 5 of the PROGRAM RULES is  
 17 "necessary" to the EM PROGRAM, as stated in YOUR MOTION TO DISMISS.

18 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12:**

19 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 20 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 21 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 22 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 23 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 24 to bring this lawsuit. Plaintiffs here seek information about the importance of a PTEM program rule  
 25 having decided not to challenge this program rule in front of the judges in their criminal cases. This  
 26 failure to raise the program rule with the criminal court suggests Plaintiffs and their counsel  
 27 understood the program rule to be part of the conditions of release from pretrial detention. The City  
 28 further objects that the interrogatory does not accurately quote the Motion to Dismiss. The City

1 responds with respect to its understanding of the importance of including Program Rule 5 as part of the  
2 PTEM Program. The City additionally objects that this contention interrogatory is premature given the  
3 current status of this case. The City responds with respect to its current understanding. Additional  
4 relevant facts will emerge as this case continues. The City additionally objects to providing privileged  
5 information in response to this interrogatory, including information subject to attorney-client, work  
6 product, deliberative process, or official information privilege protections. The City also objects to  
7 providing expert opinion evidence relevant to this interrogatory before the period for disclosure of  
8 expert opinions. The City further objects to the extent the interrogatory misrepresents the process by  
9 which participants in the criminal justice system in San Francisco have conferred regarding the  
10 program rules.

11 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The San  
12 Francisco Sheriff's Office or other peace officers at its direction must be able to search PTEM  
13 participants to ensure they are complying with the terms of the court's order on their pretrial release  
14 and the PTEM Program. These can include, for example, conditions prohibiting weapons. The four-  
15 way search condition allows the San Francisco Sheriff's Office to determine what PTEM Program  
16 participants are doing and whether they are violating the terms of their release. In lieu of detention,  
17 PTEM Program participants are being released into society. The four-way search condition supports  
18 both the interests in public safety and the participants' return to court. As peace officers, members of  
19 the San Francisco Sheriff's Office can only try to ensure public safety by trying to make sure PTEM  
20 participants are not doing activities they are legally prohibited from doing and not possessing weapons  
21 or other objects they are legally prohibited from possessing. Meanwhile, the four-way search condition  
22 does not provide for any more intensive search, and for some participants provides for less intensive  
23 searches, than PTEM Program participants would be subject to if the Superior Court directed they  
24 remain detained pending trial. The GPS monitor is helpful in informing the San Francisco Sheriff's  
25 Office about where PTEM Program participants are located but not what they are doing. The GPS  
26 monitor does not have the power to determine non-location-based criminal activity. The search  
27 condition can assist in identifying, for example, weapons, burglary tools for those charged with  
28 burglary, and car keys for those who are prohibited from driving. The four-way search condition

1 relatedly sets PTEM Program participants up for success. When the participants have a clear set of  
 2 rules, they know that they need to abide by the terms of their release. The San Francisco Sheriff's  
 3 Office is looking for reasons for PTEM Program participants to succeed, and the four-way search  
 4 condition assists in that effort.

5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

6 State all facts supporting YOUR contention that Rule 13 of the PROGRAM RULES is  
 7 "necessary" to the EM PROGRAM, as stated in YOUR MOTION TO DISMISS.

8 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13:**

9 The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 10 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 11 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 12 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 13 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 14 to bring this lawsuit. Plaintiffs here seek information about the importance of a PTEM program rule  
 15 having decided not to challenge this program rule in front of the judges in their criminal cases. This  
 16 failure to raise the program rule with the criminal court suggests Plaintiffs and their counsel  
 17 understood the program rule to be part of the conditions of release from pretrial detention. The City  
 18 further objects that the interrogatory does not accurately quote the Motion to Dismiss. The City  
 19 responds with respect to its understanding of the importance of including Program Rule 13 as part of  
 20 the PTEM Program. The City additionally objects that this contention interrogatory is premature given  
 21 the current status of this case. The City responds with respect to its current understanding. Additional  
 22 relevant facts will emerge as this case continues. The City further objects to the extent the  
 23 interrogatory misrepresents the process by which participants in the criminal justice system in San  
 24 Francisco have conferred regarding the program rules. The City additionally objects to providing  
 25 privileged information in response to this interrogatory, including information subject to attorney-  
 26 client, work product, deliberative process, or official information privilege protections. The City also  
 27 objects to providing expert opinion evidence relevant to this interrogatory before the period for  
 28 disclosure of expert opinions.

1           Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The  
 2 ability to share GPS location data for PTEM Program participants with other law enforcement  
 3 agencies is a powerful tool for public safety as well as ensuring return of PTEM Program participants  
 4 to court. Sharing of location data frequently leads to resolution of emergencies and investigations  
 5 involving PTEM Program participants. The sharing of GPS location data is very transparent. The San  
 6 Francisco Sheriff's Office requires a form and basis to permit sharing, and sharing is with other law  
 7 enforcement agencies. Sharing of GPS location data is an investigative tool similar to how law  
 8 enforcement might review security camera footage for an investigation.

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

10           IDENTIFY YOUR policy or practice with respect to the deletion or retention of the location  
 11 data of current and former EM PROGRAM participants.

12           **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14:**

13           The City incorporates the foregoing Preliminary Statement and General Objections as though  
 14 fully set forth herein, including but not limited to its objections associated with the City not being an  
 15 appropriate defendant in this case or recipient of this interrogatory given that this litigation involves a  
 16 program that the San Francisco Sheriff's Office administers in its state capacity at the direction of the  
 17 Superior Court of the State of California and its objections associated with Plaintiffs lacking standing  
 18 to bring this lawsuit. The City further objects that the Plaintiffs' definitions of "IDENTIFY" do not  
 19 make sense for this interrogatory except to the extent it would involve identification of document. The  
 20 City additionally objects that the interrogatory is potentially vague with respect to "location data" and  
 21 limits its response consistent with its understanding of the interrogatory to GPS data from Sentinel  
 22 ankle monitors pursuant to the PTEM Program. The City further objects that "YOUR" is vague in the  
 23 context of this interrogatory and responds with respect to the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. The City  
 24 additionally objects that "policy or practice with respect to the deletion or retention" is vague and  
 25 responds with respect to its retention policy for the referenced data.

26           Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the City responds as follows: The San  
 27 Francisco Sheriff's Office's current policy for retention of PTEM location data held by Sentinel is  
 28 reflected in its contract with Sentinel. The burden of deriving or ascertaining the answer to this

1 interrogatory will be substantially the same for either party. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 33(d).

2 Dated: August 28, 2023

3 DAVID CHIU  
4 City Attorney  
5 JAMES F. HANNAWALT  
6 Acting Chief Trial Deputy  
7 ALEXANDER J. HOLTZMAN  
8 JOSE A. ZELIDON-ZEPEDA  
9 Deputy City Attorneys

10 By: /s/ Alexander J Holtzman  
11 ALEXANDER J. HOLTZMAN

12 Attorneys for Defendants  
13 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, PAUL  
14 MIYAMOTO, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS SAN  
15 FRANCISCO SHERIFF

## VERIFICATION

I, MICHELE FISHER, declare as follows:

I am a Chief Deputy Sheriff at the San Francisco Sheriff's Office. I am authorized to make this verification on behalf of the City and County of San Francisco. I have read and know the contents of Defendant City and County of San Francisco's Responses to Plaintiffs' Interrogatories, Set One.

Some of the matters stated in these responses are not within my personal knowledge, and there is no individual employee of the City and County of San Francisco who has personal knowledge of all such matters. These responses were prepared with the assistance of counsel, and these responses, subject to inadvertent and undiscovered errors, are based on and necessarily limited by the records and information still in existence, presently recollected, and thus far discovered in this case. The responses are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 28th day of August 2023, at San Francisco, California.

  
CHIEF DEPUTY MICHELE FISHER

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

1 I, ANITA MURDOCK, declare as follows:

2 I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the above-  
 3 entitled action. I am employed at the City Attorney's Office of San Francisco, Fox Plaza Building,  
 4 1390 Market Street, Sixth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102.

5 On August 28, 2023, I served the following document(s):

6 **DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO'S RESPONSES TO  
 PLAINTIFFS' INTERROGATORIES, SET ONE**

7 on the following persons at the locations specified:

8 Shilpi Agarwal, Esq. Avram D. Frey, Esq. Emi Young, Esq. American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Northern California, Inc. 39 Drumm Street San Francisco, CA 94111 <u>sagarwal@aclunc.org</u> <u>afrey@aclunc.org</u> <u>eyoung@aclunc.org</u> Attorneys for Plaintiffs (415) 621-2493 (Telephone) (415) 255-1478 (Facsimile)	9 Justina Sessions, Esq. Eunice Leong, Esq. Freshfields Bruckhaus Deringer US LLP 855 Main Street Redwood City, CA 94063 <u>justina.sessions@freshfields.com</u> <u>eunice.leong@freshfields.com</u> Attorneys for Plaintiffs (650) 461-8276 (Telephone)
--	--

15 in the manner indicated below:

16  **BY ELECTRONIC MAIL:** I caused a copy of such document to be transmitted *via* electronic mail in  
 17 portable document format ("PDF") Adobe Acrobat from the electronic address: anita.murdock@sfcityatty.org.

18 I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that the  
 foregoing is true and correct.

19 Executed August 28, 2023, at Antioch, California.

20 

21 ANITA MURDOCK

22

23

24

25

26

27

28